

Application No. 10/666,247

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10-13 and 18-21 remain pending. Independent claims 1, 12 and 20 have been amended from those claims previously entered by way of the now entered August 16, 2005 amendment following the request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114.

The present amendment reflects the fact that the knee bolster assembly has the knee contact plate move in a generally linear path from said unactuated position to said actuated position and the claimed first member of said guide structure moves along the same said generally linear path relative to said second member, the first member being disposed within the second member. As well as having the knee contact plate in front of and moved by the inflation of the airbag.

This path A is clearly shown in the figures and is fully disclosed in para 0018 and 0019.


As previously noted the prior art reference the Keeler knee bolster moves by actuation of a piston which is transverse to the movement of the knee contact plate and therefore requires a scissor like pair of sliding members to move the knee contact plate.

The secondary reference, Schneider, is cited as teaching the use of a tether to attach the airbag to the contact plate. Keeler when combined with Schneider fails to grasp the required path and orientation of the claimed guide structure as presently amended. The features 48, 50, 52 comprising the guide structure must pivot to move as the airbag is deployed. The examiner is asked to look at Figure 6 and Figure 7. Absent an angular movement of the rod 52 which is pinned at 48, 50 as shown there could be no movement of the bolster knee contact plate. Which as is clearly seen is shifted by an arc shaped movement relative to the initial orientation. The rod 52 is only capable of such angular movement because it is pinned at two opposite ends.

Each amended independent claim now recites the fact that the knee contact plate and the guide members move in the same linear path. Accordingly since neither reference teaches this claim limitation they fail to make a proper obviousness rejection and the rejection must be withdrawn.

For the reasons stated above, applicants respectively request the examiner to withdraw the rejections and allow the application to pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Lonnie R. Drayer, Registration No. 30,375
Attorney for Applicants

Key Safety Systems, Inc.
5300 Allen K Breed Hwy.
Lakeland, Florida 33811-1130
Phone: (863) 668-6707 Fax: (863) 668-6130